

Remarks

Applicant and the undersigned would like to thank the Examiner for his efforts in the examination of this application, and especially for the careful reading of the claims in light of the amendments made in the previous Response. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated Claims 31 and 32 to be allowed, and Claims 3, 7, 12, 16-18, 26, 35-37, 41, 42, and 47 as containing allowable subject matter.

This indication of allowability is acknowledged with appreciation.

II. Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to Claims 1, 2, 22, 23, and 51.

These claims have been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

III. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13-15, 23-25, 27-30, 34, 40, 43, 46, and 51 under 35 USC 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13-15, 23-25, 27-30, 34, 40, 43, 46, and 51 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Ware (US 3,622,029).

The independent claims will now be discussed. Claims 1, 14, 43, and 51 have been amended to more particularly point out that which Applicant regards as his invention. In particular, the feature of the positioning of the electrical outlet has been more specifically delineated. Ware's FIG. 5 clearly shows that no power outlet is provided; rather, Ware

teaches the placement of a hard-wired switch in a recessed box member, with extra space for additional wiring provided by a conjoined supplemental box member. There is no teaching or suggestion to affix a power *outlet* within a housing, wherein the socket side of the outlet faces into the primary housing and the body of the outlet extends into the power outlet housing. Even if the structure of Ware were to be considered to be containing a power outlet, which Applicant does not concede, there is no teaching or suggestion to position the outlet to bridge the two interior compartments as recited in Claims 1, 14, 43, and 51, so that the front face of the outlet is substantially flush with a sidewall of the primary housing. Please refer to Applicant's FIG. 8 and compare with Ware's FIG. 5.

Therefore, it is respectfully believed that Claims 1, 14, 43, and 51 are not anticipated by Ware.

With regard to independent Claim 34, this rejection is respectfully traversed. The Examiner states on page 15 of the present Action that Ware discloses "an alternating current female electrical power outlet positionable between the base inner chamber and the auxiliary inner chamber and removable therefrom for providing access to the auxiliary inner chamber . . ." However, nowhere does Ware teach or suggest such an element. Ware's FIG. 3, referred to by the Examiner, does not contain a power outlet of any kind.

With regard to independent Claim 46, this rejection is respectfully traversed. Again, Ware does not teach the connection of "an alternating current power plug to an alternating current female electrical power outlet . . ." As stated above, Ware teaches a hard-wired connection of a switch to two sets of wires protruding into the primary box member from the exterior and from the supplemental box member. This arrangement precludes the possibility

JUL. 20. 2006 2:07PM

NO. 015 P. 26/27

of removing a device from the housing by merely unplugging it from the outlet, as in the instant device.

Therefore, as 35 USC 102 demands that every feature of a claim must be taught in a reference, it is respectfully believed that Claims 34 and 46 are not anticipated by Ware.

As independent Claims 1, 14, 34, 43, 46, and 51 are believed to patentably define over the cited art, Claims 2, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 23-25, 27-30, and 40 dependent therefrom are also believed to patentably define over the cited art.

IV. Rejection of Claims 4, 5, 19-22, 38, 39, 44, and 45 under 35 USC 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 4, 5, 19-22, 38, 39, 44, and 45 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ware (US 3,622,029) in view of Boteler (US 4,062,470).

As Claims 4, 5, 19-22, 38, 39, 44, and 45 depend from independent Claims 1, 14, 34, 43, these claims are also believed to patentably define over the cited art.

The Examiner has stated on page 18 of the Action that the "application currently names joint inventors." This, however, is not the case, as Mr. Plankell is a sole inventor. The Examiner is respectfully requested to correct this statement.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY**Conclusions**

Applicant respectfully submits that the above amendments place this application in a condition for allowance, and passage to issue is respectfully solicited. Applicant and the undersigned would like to again thank the Examiner for his efforts in the examination of this application and for reconsideration of the claims as amended in light of the arguments presented. The undersigned looks forward to the scheduled telephone interview with the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,



Jacqueline E. Hartt, Ph.D.

Reg. No. 37,845

ALLEN, DYER, DOPPELT, MILBRATH & GILCHRIST, P.A.

255 South Orange Avenue, Suite 1401

P.O. Box 3791


Orlando, Florida 32802

(407) 841-2330

Agent for Applicant

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that the foregoing is being sent via facsimile to the Examiner, this 11th day of April, 2006, to fax number 571-273-1973.



Edward Bradley